



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CONTRACTS—APPLICABILITY OF WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT TO FOREIGN CONTRACTS.—Defendant company and plaintiff's decedent had entered into a contract for the latter's services to be performed partly in New York and partly in New Jersey, the contract being made in New York. Death occurred in New Jersey from injuries sustained while at work in that state. Plaintiff as administrator brings this proceeding under the Workmen's Compensation Act, and recovers a judgment; the defendant brings certiorari. At the time the contract was made there was no Workmen's Compensation Act in New York; the defendant company defended on the ground that the relation was contractual, that the laws of the state of New York should govern, and that therefore no recovery should be allowed. *Held*, that the right of recovery rested not in the express New York contract but on the New Jersey Statute which as a matter of law was impliedly a part of the contract. *American Radiator Co. v. Rogge*, (N. J., 1914) 92 Atl. 85.

The court says first that there is no evidence to show that the parties intended to prohibit the laws of New Jersey from running, and could not if they desired. The analogy is pointed out to the liability under the Death Act, where it is held that the Act applies whether the contract is made in a jurisdiction where that Act is enforced or not: also to attempts by carriers to limit their liability in one jurisdiction where such limitations are invalid, by contracts made in jurisdictions where such limitations are good. *Nonotuck Silk Co. v. Adams Express Co.*, 256 Ill. 66. Finally the principle is invoked that courts will not enforce contracts which conflict with the law of the forum, even if they are valid where made. *Flagg v. Baldwin*, 38 N. J. Eq. 219. In *Pensabene v. F. & J. Auditore Co.*, 140 N. Y. Supp. 166, the facts and contract in which are identical with the instant case, it was held that a demurrer was good because the declaration did not allege that the contract was made in New Jersey; the court also says that when the contract is made in New York no implied contract regarding the laws of New Jersey can be read into it. The cases are different of course in that the New Jersey court would be more likely to read their own laws into a contract before them than would a New York court to put New Jersey laws into a New York contract; but as regards the implied contract, which the Supreme Court of New Jersey says is present, the New York court says very positively that, "Both parties must have been within the state, or they could not be held to have entered into a contract by implication under the provisions of the laws of that state." From these two decisions it still would seem to be an open question as to whether these Acts are impliedly a part of a foreign contract, although it is very probable that states having Workmen's Compensation Acts would follow the New Jersey decision when the question arises before them, but whether on the ground of implied contract or for other reasons is at least questionable.

CORPORATIONS—LICENSE TAX ON FOREIGN CORPORATIONS.—Petition by complainants to recover excise taxes paid for the privilege of transacting business within the state under the foreign corporation tax law of Massachusetts (St. 1909, C. 490 Part 3, § 56), which provides that, "Every foreign corpora-